

Remarks

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the Application. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-5 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Hanna (US 6,761,308).

Claims 7-16 were objected to but allowable if written in an independent form.

Claim 20 was allowed. The induction of allowability is greatly appreciated.

The status of claim 6 is uncertain and is (like claims 7-15 which depend therefrom) presumed by Applicant to be objected to but allowable if written in an independent form.

The Rejections

The prior art of record does not teach or suggest the recited features and relationships. Furthermore, the prior art of record is devoid of any such teaching, suggestion, or motivation for combining features of the prior art so as to produce Applicant's invention.

Claim 1 has been amended in a manner to indicate that the hinge cover can move relative to the door responsive to movement of the door. Movement of the alleged hinge cover (46) in Hanna is independent of door (160) movement. Actually, Hanna's fascia unit (46) needs to first be moved away from the door (160) so the door can be moved (col. 20, lines 21-22). Without door (160) movement, the fascia unit (46) is moved via retraction of the bolts (232, 256) due to movement of the handle (237) (col. 20, lines 3-6 and 58-66).

Claim 14 is similar to original claim 1 but further indicates that the hinge cover is mounted via the linkage to the machine body portion about a pivot axis. Support for the amendment can be found in original claim 20 and in the description of Figures 81-82. The alleged hinge cover (46) in Hanna is at best mounted to the door (160) (col. 20, lines 23-25), *not* to the alleged machine body portion (reference numeral unknown in the Action), and further *not* about a pivot axis.

Each of the dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from an independent claim. Thus, it is asserted that the dependent claims are allowable on at least the same basis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, claims have been amended to advance prosecution. Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance.

The undersigned is willing to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000